



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

the past, *Cecidomyia* has been applied in a restricted sense by different students to forms referable to widely separated tribes (*Dasyneuriariæ* and *Itonidinariæ*), not to mention the indiscriminate use of the name for any or almost any gall-making midge. It was necessary, under the old state of affairs, to either know the species or the sense in which the name *Cecidomyia* was used in a paper before one could form a definite concept of the characters for which the term stood in that particular instance. The loose application of this name to a thousand or more species referable to over 150 genera, did not materially enhance the value of the word as a precise scientific designation. In this instance the use of the prior *Itonida*, which has not been misapplied, savors more of common sense than an attempt to put among the *nomina conservanda* the variously defined and loosely applied *Cecidomyia*, even though the latter has become well established and is generally used in economic literature. A survey of the group would show that even if *Cecidomyia* was retained, it could be applied to but one genus, and that would mean that the accepted generic name for most of the economic species must of necessity be changed. *Cecidomyia* is a valuable designation and can and should be employed as the name of a biological group.

The gall midges may present exceptional conditions. We are by no means certain that the strict application of the law of priority means more incumbrances and difficulties than the establishment of *nomina conservanda*. Many of the changes necessitated by the law of priority have been made. Shall we reverse ourselves? If so, how many will accept this change of attitude and to what extent shall we go? If "well-established" or "long-used" names are desirable, how shall we select these? Is usage by the biologist, general zoologist, taxonomist, the economic entomologist or the agriculturist to determine which shall be employed? Further study will inevitably result in closer generic definition. Shall we recognize *Cecidomyia* as a valid genus with *destructor* Say as type because this is the more important agricultural species—and it is the

practical entomologist who has done most to make this name current, or accept *pini* DeGeer as type and be compelled to use a less familiar term in economic literature?

In other words, the establishment of *nomina conservanda* may fix the generic term and designate the type, only to find later that the latter is not cogenetic with the species which has made the generic name common property. This is strikingly shown by referring to a few of the well-known American forms which probably would have been changed even if *nomina conservanda* had been in existence. The following are a few well-known species which have been shifted from one genus to another because of a more correct generic definition:

*Egeria exitiosa*, now *Sanninoidea*,  
*Arctia isabella*, now *Isia*,  
*Orgyia leucostigma*, now *Hemerocampa*,  
*Anisopteryx pometaria*, now *Alsophila*,  
*A. vernata*, now *Paleacrita*,  
*Incurvaria acerifoliella*, now *Paraclemensia*.

The above names have been widely current as well as many others now relegated to synonymy, and their retention is impossible unless generic limitations are broadened, and then it would be necessary to harmonize very wide divergencies of opinion. Has any one an adequate notion as to just how much relief would be afforded by the establishment of *nomina conservanda*? Is there not a possibility that the benefits supposed to accrue therefrom have been greatly overestimated?

Finally, has sufficient time elapsed to permit a determination of the wisdom or unwisdom of a strict adherence to the law of priority? Can we assure ourselves that a comfortable adjustment to existing conditions is impossible for most individuals?

E. P. FELT

ALBANY, N. Y.,  
 May 10, 1912

#### HERMAPHRODITE SHAD IN THE DELAWARE

INSTANCES of hermaphroditism occur occasionally in the shad (*Alosa sapidissima*) taken during the spring in our fisheries, though they are usually so infrequent as to arouse the curiosity of the fishermen. I know of two

cases, both of which specimens were given to me for examination. They were obtained from fully adult fishes, which did not differ externally from the other normal ones with which they were associated. Before being opened both the examples were classed as males or "bucks." The first example was taken near Camden, New Jersey, in March of 1908, by Mr. J. B. Fine. The organs of this fish were of the average size in length, though each lobe was sharply divisible into two sections of nearly equal dimensions, these sections being well constricted where they joined in the middle. The anterior section was composed of milt and the posterior of roe. My other example was secured by Mr. Horace H. Burton at Lovett's fishery near Tullytown, Pa., in April of 1912. It was still more masculine, with the milt very large or as a single body, and the lobes nearly completely atrophied. The roe was quite small, twisted, posterior, and its lobes also more or less distorted by atrophy. Further, the roe exhibited curious milt-like globules or areas of variable size, some comparatively large, in several places.

HENRY W. FOWLER

ACADEMY OF NATURAL SCIENCES  
OF PHILADELPHIA,  
May 2, 1912

#### UNIVERSITY CONTROL

##### LETTERS FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

As to heading (1) as I comprehend it the corporation would have no powers of controlling policies. In that case I approve of it. I should not approve of having policies controlled by so heterogeneous a body and one so ignorant of academic questions as are most alumni. I should approve of their having advisory powers as to policy, and direct powers in electing trustees, so that the latter may not elect themselves. (2) I am in doubt about the whole of this section. I think it would be better that the professors should nominate, say two men, to the trustees and let them elect, so that the faculties would still essentially make the choice, but the trustees have

a part in the decision. If trustees are to have any usefulness their opinion should be of some value. I think if there is a president at all his powers, dignity and salary should be greater than that of a professor, as high administrative powers are rare and consequently of unusual value, and his duties, if conscientiously carried out, are more trying than those of a professor. Few men would accept them if they gained no added power or income and the position would otherwise be a sort of head-dean. I believe some such officer is necessary, in the present age, at any rate, but I do not think he should have power of appointments, but that these should come from the faculty, that is, from the unit-faculty to which the position to be filled belongs, as nominations, and be ratified by the trustees or other advisory board. I am inclined to think that the best way to hold the president in check would be to give him an unlimited term of office, but to give the faculty of the whole university power of veto by a two thirds or three fourths vote in any of his proposals that affected the general university, and perhaps to give the unit-faculties power of veto by a large majority vote—say four fifths, or power to demand that any policy affecting the unit be carried before the whole university faculty and voted upon; and then consider a veto the fall of the ministry. This would probably lead to closer relations between all individuals in the faculties and the presidential policies and conflicts would be settled early by discussion rather than by quarreling. It would involve also that the faculty be officially apprised at all times of what is being planned long before it was done. This is rather half-baked, as I express it. I do think, however, that what we need is to encourage the development of enlightened and able administrators rather than to clip their wings. (3) I approve of this. (4) I highly approve having outside experts called in to decide the choice of professors and I believe this might be required in certain other matters. I do not believe it is possible to pay the same salaries for the same office. This to my mind has the fatal danger that prevails in the labor unions, with